

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 1:06-CV-157

Plaintiff,

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

v.

JOYCE M. STONE, CHARLES J.
FREED, STONE & ASSOCIATES,
and JULIE SHAFFER,

Defendants.

ORDER

Defendants Joyce M. Stone and Charles J. Freed have filed six Motions including multiple motions for judgment, a motion to dismiss, a motion to dismiss a criminal case, and a motion for reconsideration of a motion to stay.

In all six of these Motions, Defendants Stone and Freed have failed to concisely state the reasons supporting the various Motions and have also failed to cite to any relevant legal authority, case law, or other supporting documents on which said Defendants base their claims. W.D. MICH. LCIVR 7.1(a). The Court notes Defendants have cited Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 as the basis of every Motion (including the Motions for Reconsideration and Dismissal). Rule 16(f) does allow for sanctions by the Court if a party or party's attorney fails to obey a scheduling order or pretrial order. However, Defendants have failed to show that sanctions are justified or applicable in this case, where Plaintiff has recently moved the Court for an extension of time to respond to Defendants' discovery requests. (*See* Dkt. No. 76.) Further, Defendants do not explain or justify why sanctions of \$125,000,000.00 or \$75,000,000.00 are appropriate. The Court also notes that said Defendants did not attempt to obtain concurrence of opposing counsel to any of the Motions. W.D.

MICH. LCIVR 7.1(d). Moreover, none of the Motions were accompanied by supporting briefs as required. W.D. MICH. LCIVR 7.1(a).

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Defendants' Motions (Dkt. Nos. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83) are **DENIED**.

Dated in Kalamazoo, MI:
February 16, 2007

/s/Richard Alan Enslen
Richard Alan Enslen
Senior United States District Judge